

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,034	12/30/2004	Andrea De Lucca	NOTAR-013US	9372
	7590 03/22/2007 NDA GARRED & BRUO	EXAMINER		
75 ENTERPRISE, SUITE 250 ALISO VIEJO, CA 92656			HOOK, JAMES F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3754	
		•		
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS 03		03/22/2007	PAPER	

# Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	10/520,034	DE LUCCA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	James F. Hook	3754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON' ute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION.  apply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21	December 2006.					
·	, =					
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1,3 and 6-8 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 2, 4, and 5 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and</li> </ul>	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and an applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the second	ccepted or b) objected to be drawing(s) be held in abeyan ection is required if the drawing(	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a lie	ents have been received.  ents have been received in Apriority documents have been eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413) )/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

Claims 2, 4, and 5 objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The subject matter of claims 2, 4, and 5 was already made part of the independent claim, however, these claims are set forth as being "withdrawn" and not "canceled" therefore the examiner cannot change the claim identifiers if it is not clear that applicant wished to cancel these claims. However, it is believed that these claims should be canceled in any subsequent response to this office action in that the subject matter is not further limiting the base claim when subject matter of claims 2, 4, and 5 already exists in the base claim.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poloni in view of Sakuraba. The patent to Poloni discloses the recited laying pipe 11, having the same shape made of three portions, the first is straight, the second spiral, the third substantially circular, a second pipe formed of a plurality of elements 10

is provide inside of the laying pipe and extends the almost entirely the length of the tube which would include being at least a little longer than the first section, an end piece 16 with an angled entry is provided and welded into the end of the laying pipe 11. The patent to Poloni discloses all of the recited structure with the exception of forming the second inner pipe as a single piece that is welded to the outer pipe and specific dimensions such as length of the inner pipe and the angle of circumference of the third section. The patent to Sakuraba discloses that it is old and well known in the art to provide pipes with inner liners to protect the outer pipe from what is traveling within the pipe, in a way protecting against wear, and to form such layers of metal and welding such to the outer pipe. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the pipe in Poloni by forming the second layer of a single piece which is welded to the outer layer to provide an equivalent form of protection for the outer pipe as suggested by Sakuraba where such would better protect the outer pipe and prevent premature failure by corrosion thereby saving money. With respect to the patent to Poloni disclosing all of the recited structure with the exception of the length of the first section and the angle of circumference of the third section, such is considered to be merely a choice of mechanical expedients where one skilled in the art would have found it obvious to use routine experimentation to arrive at optimum values to meet the needs of the user and it would have been obvious to vary these values to meet the needs of the user.

### Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3, and 6-8 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The references to Segreto, Schierenbeck, Motsenbocker, Jr., and Grosse disclosing state of the art multilayer pipes.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James F. Hook whose telephone number is (571) 272-4903. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Wednesday, work at home Thursdays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

James F. Hook
Primary Examine
Art Unit 3754

JFH